

Remarks

Claims 1-17, 19, 21, and 22 have been amended to more precisely claim the present invention. Support for these claim amendments can be found beginning on page 2, paragraph 7 through paragraph 13 and page 6, paragraph 24 through 68 of the specification. Claims 18, 20, 23, and 24 have been canceled. Claims 1-17, 19, 21, and 22 remain pending in the application.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner noted that several references were identified in the present patent application specification, but not submitted as part of an Information Disclosure Statement. A new Information Disclosure Statement that cites these references as well as others cited in related applications is being submitted along with this Amendment. The Applicant believes the concerns raised by the Examiner have been overcome by the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement submitted along with this Amendment.

Oath/Declaration

The Examiner has pointed out that the Declaration is defective as it does not identify the residence of each inventor. In accordance, with 37 C.F.R. 1.63(c), the Declaration need not include the mailing address and residence of each inventor when an application data sheet has been submitted that includes this information. In the instant application, the Applicant filed the application with an application data sheet. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the Declaration as filed and to withdraw the objection to the Declaration.

Drawings

The drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) and 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) for not including reference numerals mentioned in the specification and designating the same reference numerals for different drawing elements. In addition, other informalities were noted by the Examiner. Replacement drawing sheets are being submitted that add reference numerals identified in the specification, but previously

omitted in the drawings. In addition, the replacement drawing sheets correct the other informalities noted by the Examiner. Applicant believes that no new matter has been added by these amendments. In view of the replacement drawing sheets, the Applicant believes that the objections to the drawings have been overcome. As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

Amendments to Specification

The disclosure was objected to because of several informalities. The application has been amended to correct minor typographical errors, formatting inconsistency and to address the informalities identified by the Examiner. A substitute specification is enclosed. As required by 37 C.F.R. 1.125(c), clean and marked-up versions of the specification are enclosed. Applicant submits that the enclosed substitute specification contains no new matter. In view of the amendments made to the specification, the Applicant respectfully request that the objections to the specification be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 3, 7, 10-15, 18, 21, 22, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention. In addition, claims 8, 9, 12, 23, and 24 were objected to for informalities involving a lack of antecedent basis. The claims have been amended or canceled to overcome these objections. In view the claim amendments and cancellations, the Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph and other informalities be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 9-12 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gupta, et al. '305. Gupta '305 generally describes use of a proxy layer in a client that interacts with a web browser on the client. The proxy layer also interacts with a web agent layer on a server and both employ memory caches and intelligent filtering to reduce redundant messages transmissions. In contrast, the present

invention as now claimed in amended claims 1 and 9 manipulates web page information that has been divided into template information, sub-template information, and delta information. The template information is defined as seldom changing elements of a web page. The sub-template information is defined as information that changes less frequently than delta information and consist of elements of a web page that are shared by several templates. In short, Gupta '305 does not teach manipulating web page data divided in the three types as specified in independent claims 1 and 9.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and therefore are allowable over Gupta '305 for the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Claims 10-17, 19, 21 and 22 depend from claim 9 and therefore are allowable over Gupta '305 for the same reasons that claim 9 is allowable.

Therefore, under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) Gupta '305 fails to teach the present invention as claimed in claims 1-17, 19, 21, and 22 and a notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 13-15, 19, and 20-22 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta '305 in view of Lewis '088. In addition, Claims 8, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta '305 in view of Lewis '088, and further in view of Jois, et al. '242. Applicant respectfully suggests that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for two reasons. First, there is no suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference, or to combine the reference teachings. Secondly, the cited references, when combined, fail to teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The necessary teaching or suggestion to make the claim combination and the reasonable expectation of success is not both found in the cited references. In view of the amendments to claims 1-17, 19, 21, and 22, applicant respectfully suggests that Gupta '305, Lewis '088, and Jois, et al. '242 when considered individually or together in combination, fail to suggest or teach all of the elements of the presently pending claims. For example, as noted previously,

neither Gupta '305 nor Lewis '088 nor Jois, et al. '242 teach, as presently claimed in independent claims 1 and 9, manipulating web page information that has been divided into template information, sub-template information, and delta information. The template information is defined as seldom changing elements of a web page. The sub-template information is defined as information that changes less frequently than delta information and consist of elements of a web page that are shared by several templates.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and therefore are allowable over Gupta '305, Lewis '088, and Jois, et al. '242 for the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Claims 10-17, 19, 21 and 22 depend from claim 9 and therefore are allowable over Gupta '305, Lewis '088, and Jois, et al. '242 for the same reasons that claim 9 is allowable.

Applicant notes that Jois, et al. '242 in column 8, lines 1-8 does mention client-side generation of web pages from subtemplates. However, such an oblique reference is at best a non-enabling mention of certain elements of the present invention that only gains some meaning if improper hindsight reasoning is done after having the benefit of the teachings of the present application specification. The Applicant wishes to remind the Examiner that a judgment of obviousness can not take into account more knowledge than what was within the level of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made, and may not include additional knowledge gleaned only from the Applicant's disclosure (i.e., no hindsight reasoning is permissible).

Therefore, under 35 USC §103(a) Gupta '305, Lewis '088, and Jois, et al. '242 fail to teach the present invention as claimed in claims 1-17, 19, 21, and 22 and a notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

On the basis of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claims Claims 1-17, 19, 21, and 22 are now believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

DIGITAL RIVER, INC.

By attorneys/agents:

MOORE, HANSEN & SUMNER, PLLP

225 South Sixth Street

Suite 4850

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

(612) 332-8200

Date: 28 March 2005

By Shawn B. Dempster
Shawn B. Dempster, Registration No. 34,321

P:\CLIENT FILES\DIGITAL RIVER D33\ID33-018-01-US - NEW TEMPLATE IDENTIFICATION WITH DIFFERENTIAL CACHING\050328 OA RESPONSE.DOC